

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on February 14, 2007. In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 6-35 were pending. All pending claims were rejected. With this Amendment, claim 17 has been amended to correct a typographical error. All remaining claims are unchanged. In view of the following, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6-9, 11, 15-17, 19, 21 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,825, hereinafter "Kobayashi"). Of these, claims 1 and 24 are in independent form.

Independent claim 1 recites a method of managing data comprising "obtaining a core data set representing a constituent", "obtaining a role-specific data set representing a role assumed by the constituent", and "storing the core data set and the role-specific data set so as to distinguish the core data set from the role-specific data set." Claim 1 further recites "obtaining a second role-specific data set representing a second role assumed by the constituent" and "storing the second role-specific data set so as to separate from said role-specific data set and the core data set."

Kobayashi discloses a method of limiting data access to a database of employee information based on user attributes. A database (i.e. an employee information file, "DB") is established including employee data to which user access is restricted based on the department or group to which the user belongs (see FIG. 5). As can be seen in FIG. 4, a login management information file (LMF) associates the user's login ID with a user number and password. Once a user is identified based on the login information, a user access right management file (UMF, see FIGS. 6A-6C) is utilized to associate the user with group codes. The group codes are utilized to provide access to the employee database DB based on the user's position. Thus, a department manager has access to a portion of data in the database that may differ from the portion of data to which a regular employee has access. However, the data in the employee database is not stored in role-specific data sets. Instead, Kobayashi teaches associating roles within an enterprise (i.e., department manager, sales manager, regular employee) with access rights to a central database of employee information. As mentioned above, the login management information file (LMF) and

user access right management file (UMF) are utilized to associate a user group designation with the user based on the user's position in the enterprise. Thus, neither the employee database DB nor the LML and UMF are sets of role-specific data.

In contrast to Kobayashi, the method of claim 1 enables a core set of constituent data to be maintained for a constituent that takes on multiple roles. Data representing the multiple roles is stored in role-specific data sets so that the role data is separate from the core set of data. As mentioned above, in Kobayashi each employee has an entry in the database corresponding to information pertaining to that employee. Access rights to the information are associated with the user (i.e., the employee attempting to access the database) based on the user's role. While the employee database of Kobayashi stores information such as salary, position, and age relating to a plurality of employees, there is no teaching or suggestion of multiple role specific data sets for a constituent. Each entry in the database DB relates to a particular employee's employment information within the enterprise. The cited login management information file (LMF) and user access right management file (UMF) (shown in FIGS. 4 and 6) provide login information for the users to associate the users with group codes. However, the UMF and LMF associate roles with access rights and do not teach or suggest role-specific data sets containing role-specific information. Further, the Office Action cites the item access right management file (FMF), shown in FIG. 17A, as disclosing "storing the second role-specific data set so as to be separate from said role-specific data set and the core data set." Applicant notes that the FMF of Kobayashi provides a list of items from the employee database to which the access right groups have access. The FMF simply enables access rights to the database to be associated with a user's role and does not teach or suggest storing a role specific data set separate from another role-specific data set and the core data set.

In sum, Kobayashi does not teach or suggest a core data set, a first role-specific data set, and a second role-specific data set for a constituent. Instead, Kobayashi teaches a database containing information for a plurality of employees within an enterprise and management files for associating a role of a particular employee with access rights for that employee. As such, the system of Kobayashi does not enable information to be stored in role-specific data sets for a constituent that assumes multiple roles such the second role-specific data is separate from the first role-specific data set and the core data set.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by Kobayashi and is in allowable form. Further, it is submitted that related dependent claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11, 15-17, 19 and 21 are also in allowable form at least based on their relation to claim 1. Additionally, it is believed that at least some of these dependent claims recite features that are also neither taught nor suggested by Kobayashi. For example, dependent claim 3 recites “obtaining a role-specific data set only containing data that is different than the data stored in the core data set.” As discussed above, Kobayashi teaches an employee information database containing information relating to employees within an organization. Further, the UMF and LMF associates user access rights to data based on user roles. However, the groups disclosed in Kobayashi (i.e., department manager, regular employee, etc.) associate access rights to the central employee database with a user's position and do not teach or suggest only storing role-specific data that is different than data stored in a core data set

Dependent claim 6 recites “obtaining a second role-specific data set only containing data that is different from the data stored in the role-specific and core data sets.” As discussed above, Kobayashi discloses an employee information database containing employee information that is accessed based on access groups associated with the user. For example, if the user were a department manager, the user would have access to particular portions of the database that are accessible to other department managers. Kobayashi does not teach or suggest multiple role-specific data sets. Further, Kobayashi also does not teach or suggest a second role specific data sets that only contains data that is different from the first role specific data set and the core data set. It is noted that these are simply examples of some dependent claims that are believed to be independently patentable.

Independent claim 24 recites a method for distributing access rights comprising “receiving a set of log-in information”, “identifying, based on the log-in information, a contact record”, and “identifying an association between an organization record and the contact record.” Claim 24 further recites that the “organization record contains a collection of information related to an organization” and “selectively providing access based at least in part on the association.”

Kobayashi discloses receiving a login ID and determining access group rights based on a position of the user in the enterprise. Kobayashi does not teach or suggest an organization record containing a collection of information related to an organization. As

discussed above, the database DB relates to individual employees within an enterprise and does not contain information relating to an organization. Further, Kobayashi also does not teach or suggest identifying an association between an organization record and the contact record. Instead, the method of Kobayashi associates user access rights with a role of the user within the enterprise to determine if the user has access to the database. Thus, Kobayashi associates access rights with information fields in the employee database. For instance, a department manager may be allowed to access salary information for the employees in the database. This association in Kobayashi is not an identification of an association between an organization record and a contact records.

For at least these reasons, it is submitted that independent claim 24 is neither taught nor suggested by Kobayashi and is in allowable form. Further, it is submitted that related dependent claims 25-26 are also allowable over Kobayashi least based on their relation to claim 24.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10, 12-14, 18, 20, 22, 23 and 27-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Win et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,353, hereinafter “Win”).

Independent claim 32 provides a system for distributing access rights comprising “a data management component for receiving data and distributing the data into a plurality of constituent and role-specific records, wherein the data includes information gathered from an interaction with a constituent acting in a first capacity, as well as information gathered from a subsequent interaction with a constituent acting in a capacity different than the first.” Claim 32 further recites “a constituent-role association component for maintaining a record of relationships between constituent and role-specific records” and “a security subsystem for distributing access rights based at least in part on the record of relationships.”

The Office Action cites column 5, lines 24-55 as disclosing the data management component of claim 32. The cited section of Kobayashi discloses a user access right management file (UMF) which associates user access rights with a position of the user within an enterprise. The UMF receives the user login information and associates group rights to enable the user to access data in the employee information database. Neither the UMF nor the employee

information database teach or suggest receiving and distributing data into a plurality of constituent and role-specific records. As discussed above, Kobayashi associates roles with access rights and does not create role-specific records.

Further, Kobayashi also does not teach or suggest gathering information from a constituent acting in a first capacity as well as information gathered from a subsequent interaction with the constituent acting in a capacity different than the first. While Kobayashi discloses obtaining login information from a user to determine a user access group to which the user belongs, there is no teaching or suggestion of a subsequent interacting with the user acting in a different capacity. Further, there is also no teaching or suggestion of distributing data into records where the data is gathered from a subsequent interaction with a constituent acting in a different capacity than the first interaction.

It is also submitted that Kobayashi does not teach or suggest the constituent-role association component of claim 32. In particular, the cited section of Kobayashi (column 5, lines 50-55) discloses associating a position of the user within the enterprise with access rights to employee data. However, the cited section, as well as the entire Kobayashi reference, does not teach or suggest maintaining a record of relationships between constituent and role-specific records. In contrast, the method of Kobayashi associates user access rights with a role of the user within the enterprise to determine if the user has access to the database. This association in Kobayashi is not a record of relationships between constituent and role-specific records.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Kobayashi nor Win, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest the features of claim 32. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 32 is in allowable form. Further, it is believed that dependent claims 10, 12-14, 18, 20, 22, 23, 27-31, and 33-35 are also in allowable form at least based on their relation to independent claims 1, 24, and 32. Additionally, it is believed that at least some of these dependent claims recite features that are also neither taught nor suggested by the cited references. For example, dependent claim 27 recites "providing access to role-specific records related to the organization record." As discussed above, Kobayashi does not teach or suggest an organization record containing a collection of information related to an organization. Further, neither Kobayashi nor Win teach or suggest role-specific records related to an organization. In particular, the cited section of Win (col. 5, ln. 8-53) disclose implementing access rules defined by user roles. A role, as defined by

Win, reflects a relationship of a user to the organization. Examples of roles in Win include employee, customer, distributor, etc. Thus, the cited section of Win does not teach or suggest role-specific records related to an organization.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims, namely claims 1-3 and 6-32, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:cjv:rdg